

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/048,170	Applicant(s) KUNO ET AL.	
	Examiner Bareford	Art Unit 1762	

All Participants:

 (1) Shrive Beck

 (2) Robert Pous
Status of Application: allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 2/4/04
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Beck and Mr. Pous discussed the two issues raised by the petition filed November 7, 2003. As to the first issue, Mr. Beck that the language of the Reasons for Allowance was intended to be exemplary, and this will be clarified in a supplemental Reasons for Allowance. As to the second issue, it was agreed that an Examiner's Amendment would be made to page 11, line 17 to change "least" to "most" in order to take care of applicant's concerns as expressed in the petition and the examiner's concerns as to the presence of contradictory language between the first and second paragraphs of page 11. .